

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

| | | | |
|----------|------------------------------|------|-------------|
| Case No. | CV 23-2271 PA (PVC) | Date | May 9, 2023 |
| Title | Ladarius Downs v. Jane Doe 2 | | |

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Present: The Honorable | PERCY ANDERSON, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE |
|------------------------|--|

| | | |
|-----------------------|--------------|-----|
| Kamilla Sali-Suleyman | Not Reported | N/A |
|-----------------------|--------------|-----|

| | | |
|--------------|----------------|----------|
| Deputy Clerk | Court Reporter | Tape No. |
|--------------|----------------|----------|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs: | Attorneys Present for Defendants: |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|------|------|
| None | None |
|------|------|

Proceedings: IN CHAMBERS - COURT ORDER

On March 27, 2023, Plaintiff filed a civil rights complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (“Complaint”), along with a request to proceed without prepayment of the filing fees (“IFP Request”). On March 30, 2023, the Court granted Plaintiff’s IFP Request and directed him to submit an initial partial payment of the filing fees. The Court warned Plaintiff that this action may be dismissed if the initial partial payment was not received by the Court within 30 days.

More than 30 days have now passed and the Court has not received Plaintiff’s initial partial payment.

Accordingly, this action is hereby **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** for Plaintiff’s failure to prosecute and/or comply with the Court’s Order. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); see also Link v. Wabash R. Co., 370 U.S. 626, 630-31 (1962) (“The authority of a court to dismiss sua sponte [pursuant to Rule 41(b)] for lack of prosecution has generally been considered an ‘inherent power,’ governed not by rule or statute but by the control necessarily vested in courts to manage their own affairs so as to achieve the orderly and expeditious disposition of cases.”); Pagtalunan v. Galaza, 291 F.3d 639, 642-43 (9th Cir. 2002), cert. denied, 538 U.S. 909 (2003) (court may dismiss action for failure to follow court order).

IT IS SO ORDERED.